

## REMARKS

Claims 3-4, 8-25, 27-29, and 31-37 were previously cancelled. In the instant Amendment, claims 1-2, 5-7, 26, 30, and 38-50 have been cancelled and new claims 51-70 have been added. Claims 51-70 are currently pending in the instant application.

Support for the new claims can be found in the amended specification. More specifically, support for new independent claims 51, 59, and 66 and dependent claims 52-58, 60-65, and 67-70 can be found throughout the instant amended application as filed, including in FIG. 8, in paragraphs 20-24, 26-34, and 39-43, and in the claims as originally filed.

No new subject matter has been added with these amendments. The disclosure added in the attached Substitute Specification in newly added paragraphs 26-34 was originally included in parent Application No. 09/883,779 (at page 11, line 5 through page 13, line 11; page 6, lines 10-17, and page 10, line 1 through page 11, line 2), which was incorporated by reference in the instant application as filed. Because this information was incorporated by reference into the instant application, it is not new subject matter.

### **Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank Examiner England for discussing the proposed claims (which are canceled herein as set forth above), the Pre-Interview Communication, and the Barroux reference during the telephonic interview with Applicant's undersigned representative and inventor Robert S. McConnell on January 26, 2009.

During the interview, Examiner England acknowledged that the proposed claim amendments provided to the Examiner were likely not anticipated by the Barroux reference. However, Examiner England asserted that it was likely that he could find prior art references sufficient to support an obviousness rejection of those claims. While Applicants respectfully disagree that the proposed claims would have been rendered obvious based on additional prior art, in the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have cancelled the previously pending claims and added new claims that Applicants respectfully submit are in condition for allowance.

### **Independent Claim 51 Is Patentable Over Barroux**

Independent claim 51 is directed in part to a system having "at least one predetermined limited user access level programmed into the central processor, wherein the at least one predetermined limited user access level is configured to restrict access of at least one user to

solely a predetermined subset of the asset information based on a configurable user profile of the user.”

It is respectfully submitted that Barroux fails to teach, suggest, or provide any reason for such a predetermined limited user access level. Instead, Barroux discloses solely a system having a database that can “both provide a snapshot of the current state of the network and also track changes in configuration over time.” Nowhere does Barroux teach or suggest a predetermined limited user access level. Thus, at least for these reasons, Barroux does not teach suggest, or provide any reason for the predetermined limited user access level of claim 51.

**Claims Depending from Claim 51 Are Patentable Over Barroux**

Because claims 52-58 depend directly or indirectly from claim 51 and incorporate all the limitations of claim 51, the above argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claims 52-58 are not unpatentable based on Barroux.

**Independent Claim 59 Is Patentable Over Barroux**

Independent claim 59 is directed in part to a system having tracking software “configured to track the asset information received from the notification processor and the asset information stored in the database to identify a predefined condition relating to maintenance or operational data,” and further having notification software “configured to generate a notification relating to the predefined condition and distribute the notification to at least one predetermined location.”

It is respectfully submitted that Barroux fails to teach, suggest, or provide any reason for such tracking or notification software as claimed. More specifically, Barroux fails to teach, suggest, or provide any reason for tracking software configured to track asset information stored in a database to identify a predefined condition relating to maintenance or operational data or for notification software configured to generate a notification relating to the predefined condition. Instead, Barroux discloses a system having a database that “facilitates easy tracking of node configuration over time.” See Barroux, col. 8, ll. 57-58. Nowhere does Barroux teach or suggest software configured to track asset information stored in the database to identify a predefined condition or software configured to generate a notification relating to the predefined condition. Thus, at least for these reasons, Barroux does not teach suggest, or provide any reason for the tracking or notification software of claim 59.

**Claims Depending from Claim 59 Are Patentable Over Barroux**

Because claims 60-65 depend directly or indirectly from claim 59 and incorporate all the limitations of claim 59, the above argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claims 60-65 are not unpatentable based on Barroux.

**Independent Claim 66 Is Patentable Over Barroux**

Independent claim 66 is directed in part to a system having at least one predetermined limited user access level “configured to restrict access of at least one user to solely a predetermined subset of the asset information based on a configurable user profile of the user.”

It is respectfully submitted that Barroux fails to teach, suggest, or provide any reason for such a predetermined limited user access level. Nowhere does Barroux teach or suggest a predetermined limited user access level. Thus, for at least these reasons, Barroux does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason for the predetermined limited user access level of claim 66.

**Claims Depending from Claim 66 Are Patentable Over Barroux**

Because claims 67-70 depend directly or indirectly from claim 66 and incorporate all the limitations of claim 66, the above argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claims 67-70 are not unpatentable based on Barroux.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 51-70 are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is respectfully requested. Please direct any calls in connection with this application to the undersigned at (612) 766-8739.

Respectfully submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

By: /Sean D. Solberg, Reg. No. 48,653/  
Sean D. Solberg  
Reg. No. 48,653  
612/766-8739  
Customer No.: 25764

Dated: February 2, 2009